

THE DRAWINGS

The Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a). Applicant notes that in an embodiment of the present invention, the "special purpose register" of claims 8 and 19 are inherently part of the access channel circuits (300) of Figures 2 and 4(a). (See page 17, lines 31-33 of the present application). Further, in an embodiment of the present invention, the "automatic transfer engines" of claims 7 and 17 are inherently part of the access channel (102) (see page 15, lines 1-18 of the present application). Hence, both of these elements are disclosed in the Specification which are shown in the Figures. Therefore, the drawings show these features of the invention as cited in the claims. It is noted that the drawing is not a place to find antecedent basis. *Ex parte Siegmund and Cole*, 156 U.S.P.Q. 477, 478 (PO Bd. App. 1967).

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.) Claim Amendments

The Applicants have amended claims 6, 8, 17 and 19 and claims 1-5, 10, 12-16, 21 and 23-24 have been canceled. Accordingly, claims 6-9, 11, 17-20 and 22 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

2.) Allowable Subject Matter

The Applicants gratefully acknowledge the conditional allowance of claims 6-9, 11, 17-20 and 22.

3.) Examiner Objections - Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings because the drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. The Applicants have amended the drawings to show every feature in the claims. The Examiner's approval of the drawing changes is respectfully requested.

4.) Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected claims 3 and 6-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Applicants have canceled claim 3 and have amended claims 6 and 8 to more distinctly claim the invention. The Examiner's consideration of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

5.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 10, 12-16, 21 and 23-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Foster, et al. (US 6,038,630). The Examiner further rejected claims 1-5, 10, 12-16, 21 and 23-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Welker, et al. (US 6,076,139). The Applicants have canceled claims 1-5, 10, 12-16, 21 and 23-24.

5.) Prior Art Not Relied Upon


In the Relevant Art paragraph of the Office Action, the Examiner stated that 6,378,049 to Stracovsky, et al., 5,202,973 to Ramanujan, et al., and 5,878,240 to Tomko are cited as relevant art. None of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the present invention.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicants believe all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for claims 6-9, 11, 17-20 and 22.

The Applicants request a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael Cameron
Registration No. 50,298

Date: _____

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-4145
michael.cameron@ericsson.com